

Books Printed by FINCHAM GARDINER.

A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleets* Unreasonableness of Separation, in Answer to Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Lob*, &c.

Considerations of present use, considering the Danger Resulting from the Change of our Church-Government.

1. A Perswasion to Communion with the Church of *England*.

2. A Resolution of some Cases of Conscience, which Respect Church-Communion.

3. The Case of indifferent things, used in the Worship of God, Proposed and Stated by considering these Questions, &c.

4. A Discourse about Edification.

5. The Resolution of this Case of Conscience, *Whether the Church of England's Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome, makes it Unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of England?*

6. A Letter to *Anonymus*, in Answer to his Three Letters to Dr. *Sherlock* about Church-Communion.

7. Certain Cases of Conscience resolved, concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worship. The first Part.

Books Printed by FINCHAM GARDINER.

A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleets* Unreasonableness of Separation, in Answer to Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Lob*, &c.

Considerations of present use, considering the Danger Resulting from the Change of our Church-Government.

1. A Perswasion to Communion with the Church of *England*.

2. A Resolution of some Cases of Conscience, which Respect Church-Communion.

3. The Case of indifferent things, used in the Worship of God, Proposed and Stated by considering these Questions, &c.

4. A Discourse about Edification.

5. The Resolution of this Case of Conscience, *Whether the Church of England's Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome, makes it Unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of England?*

6. A Letter to *Anonymus*, in Answer to his Three Letters to Dr. *Sherlock* about Church-Communion.

7. Certain Cases of Conscience resolved, concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worship. The first Part.

THE
RESOLUTION
OF THIS
C A S E
OF
CONSCIENCE.

Whether the Church of *England's*
Symbolizing so far as it doth
with the Church of *Rome*,
makes it Unlawful to hold
Communion with the Church
of *England*?

L O N D O N :

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Jun. for *Fincham Gardiner* at
the *White Horse* in *Ludgate-street*, 1683.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

The Case.

Whether the Church of Englands Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome, makes Communion therewith Unlawful?

IN speaking to this Case, we will,
First, Premise, that there is a *wide and vast distance* betwixt the Church of *England* and that of *Rome*.

Secondly, Shew, that a Churches Symbolizing or agreeing in some things with the Church of *Rome*, is no Warrant for Separation from the Church so agreeing.

Thirdly, Shew, that the Agreement that is between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, is in no wise *such*, as will make Communion with the Church of *England* Unlawful.

First. We think it necessary to Premise, that there is a *wide and vast distance* betwixt the Church of *England* and that of *Rome*. Our Church having renounced all Communion with the Church of *Rome*, this speaks the greatest distance in the *general* betwixt the two Churches. And as their distance particularly in *Government* is manifest to all, from our Churches having utterly cast off the Jurisdiction of the *Papacy*, so it is easie to shew, that there is likewise a mighty distance betwixt them, in *Doctrine*, *Worship* and *Discipline*.

cipline. But we shall not stand to shew this in each of these *distinctly*, but rather make choice of *this* Method, *viz.* to shew that *our* Church is most distant from, and opposite to the Church of *Rome*.

1. *In all those Doctrines and Practices, whereby this Church deprives her Members of their due Liberty, and miserably enslaves them.*

2. *In all those Doctrines and Practices, in which she is justly Charged with plainly Contradicting the Holy Scriptures.*

3. *In each of their publick Prayers and Offices.*

4. *In the Books they each receive for Canonical.*

5. *In the Authority on which they each of them found their whole Religion.*

First, Our Church is at the greatest distance from that of Rome, in all those Doctrines and Practices, by which she deprives her Members of their due Liberty, and miserably enslaves them. For Instance,

1. This Church denieth her Members all Judgment of *Discretion* in matters of Religion: She obligeth them to follow her *blindfold*, and to resolve both their faith and judgment into *hers*; as assuming *infallibility* to her self, and binding all under pain of *Damnation* to *believe* her infallible.

But *our* Church permits us the *full* enjoyment of our due Liberty in believing and judging; and we Act not like Members of the Church of *England*, if (according to *St. Pauls* injunction) we *prove not all things*, that we may *hold fast that which is good*, if we *believe every Spirit*, which *St. John* cautions us against) and do not *try the Spirits, whether they be of God*; which he requires us to do. 'Tis impossible that our Church should oblige us to an *implicite* faith in herself, because she disclaimeth all pretence to *infallibility*: Our Church tells us, in her 19th. Article, that, *As the Churches*

Churches of Jerusalem, and Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their Living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith. And our Churches acknowledgment is plainly implied, in asserting the most famous Churches in the World, to have erred from the Faith, that she *her self* must needs be Obnoxious to Error in matters of Faith; and that she would be guilty of the highest *impudence* in denying it.

2. The Church of Rome imposeth a deal of most slavish Drudgery in the vast multitude of her *Rites and Ceremonies*, and *unreasonably severe Tasks*, and *cruel Penances*. As to her *Ceremonies*, they are so vast a number, as are enough to take up (as Sir Edwyn Sandys hath observed) a great part of a mans life merely to gaze on: And abundance of them are so vain and Childish, so marvellously odd and uncouth, as that they can *Naturally bring* (to use that Gentlemans words, who was a curious observer of them in the Popish Countries) *no other than disgrace and contempt, to those exercises of Religion wherein they are stirring.* In viewing only those that are enjoined in the Common *Ritual*, one would bless ones self to think how it should enter into the minds of *Men*, and much more of *Christians*, to invent such things. And the like may be said of the Popish *Tasks and Penances*, in imposing of which the Priests are Arbitrary, and ordinarily lay the most Severe and Cruel ones on the lightest offenders, when the most Loud and Scandalous come off with a bare saying of their Beads thrice over, or some such insignificant and idle business.

But the Church of *England* imposeth nothing of that Drudgery, which makes such Vassals of the poor Papists. Her *Rites* are exceeding few, and those plain and *easie*, *grave* and *manly*, founded on the Practice of

the Church, long before Popery appeared upon the Stage of the World. Our Church hath abandon'd the *five Popish Sacraments*, and contents her self with those two which Christ hath ordained : As is to be seen in her 25th. Article, where she declares that, *There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel; being such as have grown, partly of the Corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures: But yet have not like Nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lords Supper: For that they have not any visible Sign or Ceremony ordained of God. The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ, to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, &c.* And in saying that our Church owns not the forementioned Popish Sacraments, is implied that she hath nothing to do with any of those very many Superstitious Poperies which are enjoined in the offices appointed for the Administration of those Sacraments.

Again our Church no whit more imitates that of Rome in her Cruel Tasks and Penances, than in her Ceremonies; as is needless to be shewed.

In short, in our Churches few Rites, she hath used no other Liberty, but what she judgeth agreeable to those Apostolical Rules of *Doing all things decently and in order; and Doing all things to Edification.* And she imposeth her Rites (not as the Church of Rome doth hers) as necessary, and as parts of Religion, but as merely indifferent and changeable things; as we find in her 34th. Article, where she declares that, *Every Particular or National Church, hath Authority to Ordain, Change and Abolish Ceremonies, or Rites of the Church,*

Church, Ordained only by Mans Authority, so that all things be done to Edifying. And this Article begins thus, It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of Countries, Times and Manners; so that nothing be Ordained against Gods Word.

2. The Church of Rome Subjects her Members by severall of her Doctrines to enslaving Passions. For instance, that of *Purgatory* makes them all their life time subject to the bondages of *Fear*; at least those of them who are so solicitous about the life to come, as to entertain any mistrust or doubting (as it's strange if the most *Credulous* of them do not) concerning the Efficacy of *Penances* and *Indulgences*.

Her Doctrine of *Auricular Confession* subjects all that are not forsaken of all Modesty to the passion of *Shame*.

Her Doctrine of the Dependence of the Efficacy of the *Sacraments* upon the *Priests intention*, must needs expose all considerative people, and those who have any serious concern about their state hereafter, to great *Anxiety* and *Solicitude*.

But these Doctrines are all rejected by the Church of England. That of *Purgatory* she declares against in these Words: *Article 22d. The Romish Doctrine of Purgatory, is a vain thing fondly invented and grounded on no Warranty of Scripture, but rather Repugnant to the word of God. As to that of Auricular Confession, nothing like it is taught or Practised in our Church.* Her Members are obliged only to Confess their Sins to God, except when 'tis necessary to Confess them to Men, for the relieving of their Consciences, and their obtaining the Prayers of others; or in order to the righting of those they have wronged, when due satisfaction can't otherwise be made; or in order to their giving Glory to God,

God, when they are justly accused and their guilt proved: in which cases and such like, 'tis without dispute our duty to confesse to *Men*.

Nor have we any such Doctrine in *our Church*, as that of the *Dependence of the Efficacy of the Sacraments on the Priests intention*; but the *Contrary* is sufficiently declared, *Article 26th*, viz. that *The Efficacy of Christs Ordinance is not taken away by the Wickedness of those that Minister*.

3. The Church of *Rome* subjects her Members by not a few of her Doctrines and Practices to *Vile Affections* and *Vices* of all sorts: As might be largely shewed, and will be in *part* under the next head of discourse.

See *Libertas Evangelica*.
Chap. 17.

But *our Church* neither maintains any Licentious Principle, nor gives Countenance to any such Practice; our Adversaries themselves being Judges.

Secondly. The Church of *England* is at the greatest distance from that of *Rome*, in all those Doctrines and Practices in which she is justly charged with plainly contradicting the *Holy Scripture*. For instance, (not to repeat any of those ranked under the foregoing head, several of which may also fall under this,) Her Doctrines of *Image Worship*, of *Invocation of Saints* (with her gross practising upon them) of *Transubstantiation*, of *Pardons* and *Indulgencies*, of the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, wherein Christ is pretended to be still offered up afresh for the quick and dead. Her keeping the *Holy Scriptures* from the *Vulgar*, and making it so hainous a crime to read the *Bible*, because by this means her foul Errors will be in such danger of being discovered, and the People, of not continuing implicate believers. Her injoyning the saying of *Prayers*, and the Administration of the *Sacraments* in an unknown Tongue. Her Robbing the *Laitie* of the Cup in the *Lords Supper*.
Her

Her prohibiting Marriage to Priests. Her Doctrines of Merit, and works of Supererogation. Her making simple Fornication a mere Venial sin. Her damning all that are not of her Communion. Her most devilish cruelties towards those whom she is pleased to pronounce Hereticks. Her darling Sons Doctrines of Equivocation and Mental Reservations; of the Popes power of dispensing with the most Solemn Oaths, and of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance to their Lawful Princes: with many others not now to be reckoned up.

But the Church of *England* Abominates these and the like Principles and Practices. As to the instances of *Image Worship, Invocation of Saints, and Pardons and Indulgences*, what our Church declareth concerning *Purgatory*, she adds concerning these things too, *Article 22d. viz. That the Romish Doctrine concerning Pardons, Worship and Adoration, as well of Images as of Relicks, as also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented and grounded on no Warranty of Scripture; but rather Repugnant to the Word of God.* And as there is no such Practice as Worshipping of Images in our Church, so all are destroyed which Popery had Erected among us. Nor have we in our Church any *Co-Mediators* with Jesus Christ; we Worship only one God, by one only Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus. And the now mentioned Practices, our Church doth not only declare to be *Repugnant to the Holy Scriptures*, but to be likewise most grossly *Idolatrous, viz. in the Homilies.*

As to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, our Church declareth her sense thereof *Article 28th.* in these Words: *Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is Repugnant to the plain terms of Scripture; overthroweth the Nature*
of

of a Sacrament; and hath given occasion to many Superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Lords Supper, only after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and Eaten in the Supper is Faith. The Sacrament of the Lords Supper, was not by Christs Ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or Worshipped. As to the Sacrifices of the Mass, see what our Church saith of it, Article 31st. viz. That the offering of Christ once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World, both Original and Actual; and there is none other Satisfaction for sins but that alone. Wherefore the Sacrifices of the Mass, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have Remission of pain or guilt, were Blasphemous Fables, and dangerous deceits.

As to the Church of Romes locking up the Scriptures, and prohibiting the reading of them, Our Church hath not only more than once caused them to be Translated into our Mother-Tongue, but also, as I need not shew, gives as free Liberty to the reading of the Bible, as of any other Book; nor is any duty in our Church esteemed more necessary, than that of Reading the Scriptures, and Hearing them read.

As to Praying and Administring the Sacraments in an unknown Tongue, as this is contrary to the Practice of the Church of England, so is it to her Declaration also, Article 24th. viz. That it is a thing plainly Repugnant to the Word of God, and the Custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayers in the Church, or to Administer Sacraments in a Tongue not understood of the People.

As to *Robbing the Laity of the Cup in the Lords Supper*; in *Our Church* they may not receive the *Bread*, if they refuse the *Cup*. And *Article 30.* tells us, *That the Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Laity, for both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christs Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be Administred to all Christians alike.* As to prohibiting *Marriage to Priests*, this is declared against, *Article 32.* *Bishops, Priests and Deacons are not Commanded by Gods Law, either to vow the Estate of single Life, or to abstain from Marriage*; therefore it is *Lawful* for them as for all other *Christian Men*, to *Marry* at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

As to the *Popish Doctrine of Merit*, *Our Church* declares against this, *Article 11.* *We are accounted righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own Works, or Deservings.* Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, (*viz.* such a Faith as purifies the Heart, and works by Love) is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort; as more largely is expressed in the *Homily of Justification.*

As to the *Doctrine of Supererogation*, this is confuted, *Article 14.* *Voluntary Works, besides, over and above Gods Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without Arrogance and Impiety: For by them Men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, when ye have done all that are Commanded to you, say, we are unprofitable Servants.*

As to making *simple Fornication* a meer *Venial sin*; *Our Church* will endure no such Doctrine. For as in the *Litany* she calls *Fornication* expressly a *deadly sin*,

so hath it ever been accounted in Our Church, one of the most deadly, even considered as *distinct* from Adultery.

As to the Church of *Rome*, Damning all that are not of her Communion, the Church of *England* is guilty of no uncharitableness like it; and never pronounced so sad a sentence against those in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, as great a detestation as she expresseth, in the *Homilies*, especially of her Idolatrous and Wicked Principles and Practices. She is satisfied to Condemn the gross Corruptions of that Apostate Church, and leaves her Members to stand or fall to their own Master, nor takes upon her to *Unchurch* her.

And as to the remaining most *Immoral* Principles and Practices of the *Romish* Church, which are all as contrary to *Natural* as to *revealed* Religion, the greatest Enemies Our Church hath, cannot surely have the forehead to charge her with giving the least countenance to any *such*. There being no Church in Christendom that more severely Condemns all instances of Unrighteousness and Immorality.

Thirdly, The Church of *England* is at a mighty distance from the Church of *Rome*, in reference to their *Publick Prayers and Offices*. Whereas our *Liturgy* hath been by many Condemned as greatly resembling the *Mass Book*, all that have compared them do know the contrary, and that there is a vast difference between them, both as to *matter* and *form*: Although some few of the *same* Prayers are found in both, and three or four of the *same* Rites; of which more hereafter. To shew this throughout in the *particulars*, would be a very long and tedious task: I will therefore single out the *Order of Administration of Infant-Baptism*, as we have it in the *Roman Ritual*, and desire the Reader to compare it with that in our *Liturgy*; and by *this* take a measure of the likeness between our *Liturgy*, and the

Mass

Mass Book, &c. there being no greater agreement between the Morning and Evening Services, and the other Offices of each, than is between *these* two ; excepting that, besides the *Lords Prayer*, there is no Prayer belonging to the *Popish* Office of Baptism to be met with in *ours*.

For the sake of the Readers who understand no more of the Language, that the Popish Prayers and Offices are expressed in, than the generality of those that make use of them, take the following account of the Popish Administration of *Infant-Baptism* in our own Tongue.

To pass by the long Bedroul of Preparatory Prescriptions, the Priest, being drest in a Surplice and Purple Robe, calls the infant to be Baptized by his Name, and saith, *what askest thou of the Church of God ?* The God-Father answers, *Faith*. The Priest saith again, *What shalt thou get by Faith ?* The God-Father replies, *Eternal life*. Then adds the Priest, *If therefore thou wilt Enter into life, keep the Commandments ; thou shalt Love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, &c. and thy Neighbour as thy self*.

Next the Priest blows three gentle puffs upon the Infants face, and saith (as if we come all into the World possessed by the Devil,) *Go out of him O unclean Spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost the Comforter*. Then with his Thumb he makes the Sign of the Cross, on the Infants Forehead and Breast, saying ; *Receive the Sign of the Cross both in thy Forehead, and in thy heart : Take the faith of the Heavenly Præcepts, and be thy manners such, as that thou maist now become the Temple of God*.

After this follows a Prayer that God would always protect this his *Elect one* (calling him by his Name) that is *Signed with the Sign of the Cross, &c.* And after a longer Prayer (the Priest laying his hand on the

Infants head) comes the *Benediction of Salt* : of which *this is the Form.*

*I exorcize (or conjure) thee O Creature of Salt, in the Name of God the Father Almighty ✠, and in the Love of our Lord Jesus Christ ✠, and in the Power of the Holy Ghost ✠. I conjure thee by the Living God ✠, by the True God ✠, by the Holy God ✠; by the God ✠ which Created thee for the safeguard of Mankind, and hath ordained that thou shouldest be consecrated by his Servants, to the People entring into the Faith, that, in the Name of the Holy Trinity, thou shouldest be made a wholesome Sacrament, for the driving away of the Enemy. Moreover we Pray thee O Lord our God, that in Sanctifying thou wouldest Sanctifie ✠ this Creature of Salt, and in Blessing thou wouldest Bless it ✠, that it may be to all that receive it a perfect Medicine remaining in their Bowels, in the Name of the same Jesus Christ our Lord; who is about to come to judge the quick and dead, and the World by fire, Amen. This Idle and prophane Form being recited, the Priest proceeds in his Work with the poor Infant; and next, putting a little of this Holy Salt into his mouth, he calls him by his Name, and saith, *Take thou the Salt of Wisdom*: (and adds most impiously) *be it thy propitiation unto Eternal Life, Amen.* This ended with the *Pax tecum*, God Almighty is next mockt with a Prayer, *That this Infant, who hath tasted this first food of Salt may not be suffered any more to hunger, but may be filled with Celestial Food, &c.**

Now follows another Exorcising of the Devil, wherein he is conjured as before, and most wofully becalled. And next the Priest Signs the Infant again with his Thumb on the Forehead, saying, *And this Sign of the Holy Cross ✠ which we give to his Forehead, thou Cursed Devil never dare thou to Violate. By the same Jesus*

Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen. And now after all this tedious expectation, we see some Sign of Baptism approaching, for the Priest puts his hand again on the Infants head, and puts up a very good Prayer for him, in order to his Baptism.

The Prayer being ended, he puts part of his Robe upon the Infant, and brings him within the Church, (for he hath been without all this while) saying, (calling him by his Name) *Enter thou into the Temple of God, that thou mayest partake with Christ in Eternal Life, Amen.* Then follow the Apostles Creed, and the *Pater Noster*. But after all this here's more exercise for our Patience, for the Priest falls to his fooling again: For now comes another Exorcising or Conjuring of the Devil. And this being also concluded, the Priest takes Spittle out of his Mouth, and touches therewith the Ears and Nostrils of the Infant. And in touching his right and left Ear, he saith, *Ephphatha* (i.e.) *Be opened.* Then, touching his Nostrils, he saith, *for a savour of Sweetness: no doubt mighty sweet.* Another Conjunction of the Devil followeth, in these Words, *Be packing, O Devil, for the judgment of God is at hand.*

And now the Priest will make you hope again that he hath not forgotten his main business: For he asks the Infant, whether he renounces the *Devil*, and *all his Works*, and *all his Poms*; of which he makes three Questions; and the God-Father distinctly answers to them. But alas he is thus soon gone off from his proper Work again, for now you have him dipping his Thumb in *Holy Oyl*, and anointing the Infant with it in his breast, and betwixt his Shoulders, in the figure of a Cross, saying, *I anoint thee with the Oyl of Salvation, in Christ Jesus our Lord, that thou mayest obtain Eternal Life, Amen.*

Then

Then next he puts off his *Purple Robe*, and puts on another of a *White Colour*, and falls in good earnest to the great business: for having askt three more Questions out of the *Creed*, and received the God-Fathers Answers, and *this* other Question, *Whether the Infant will be Baptized?* and received the God-Fathers answer to *that*, he pours Water thrice upon the Childs head, as he reciteth over it our Saviours Form of Baptism, doing it each time, at the naming of each of the *three Persons*.

And now (that the Priest mayn't conclude less wisely than he began) comes the *Chrism* or *Holy Ointment*, in which dipping his Thumb, and Anointing the Infant upon the Crown of his head in the figure of a Cross, he thus Prayeth, *O God omnipotent, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath regenerated thee of Water and the Holy Ghost, and who hath given thee Pardon of all thy Sins, Anoint thee with the Chrism of Salvation, in the same Christ Jesus our Lord, to Eternal Life, Amen.* And next, after the *Pax tibi*, and the wiping of his Thumb, and the Anointed head, he takes a White Linnen Cloath and putting it on the Childs head, useth this Form, *Take the white Garment which thou maist carry unspotted before the Tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou maist have Eternal Life, Amen.*

And Lastly, He puts into the Childs, or his God-Fathers hand a lighted Candle, and saith, *Receive the burning Lamp, and keep thy Baptism blameless, keep Gods Commandments, that when the Lord shall come to the Wedding, thou maist meet him, together with all his Saints, in the Celestial Court, and maist have Eternal Life, and live for ever, Amen.* Concluding all with this Form, *Go in Peace and the Lord be with thee, Amen.*

And as if there were not fooling and ridiculous doings enough in this Office of the *Common Ritual*, there are

are divers others added to them, in the *Pastorale*: For instance, the Ceremony of blowing thrice in the Childs Face is here to be done *Crossways*. And after the Conjur-
 ation following, to which *two* more are here added, the Priest Crossing his *Forehead*, saith, *I Sign thee in the Forehead in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou maist trust in him.* Then he Crosseth his *Eyes*, saying, *I bless thy Eyes, that thou maist see his Brightness.*

Then his *Ears*, saying, *I bless thine Ears that thou maist hear the Word of his truth.* Then his *Nostrils*, saying, *I bless thy Nostrils, that thou maist smell his sweetness.* Then his *Breast*, saying, *I bless thy Breast, that thou maist believe in him.* Then his *Shoulders*, saying, *I bless thy Shoulders, that thou maist bear the Yoke of his Service.* Then his *Mouth*, saying, *I bless thy Mouth, that thou mayst Confess him, who Lives and Reigns God with the Father, &c.* Again, The Child here receives the Sign of the Cross in his Right-hand, the Priest saying, (calling him by his Name) *I deliver thee the Sign of our Lord Jesus Christ, in thy Right-hand, that thou maist Sign thy self, and drive away the Enemy on all sides from thee, and maist have Eternal Life, &c.*

Which Crossings are also prescribed by the Ritual in the Office of Adult Baptism, but with a variation of the Forms.

Here also the Priest is to lay his Robe on the Child in the Figure of a Cross, with a many dire menaces tormenting the Devil before his time. Here also the *Ave Maria* is added to the *Pater Noster*. The Infant likewise hath *this* Benediction pronounced over him before his going to the Font; *The Benediction of God the Father ✠ Almighty, and of his Son ✠ and Holy Ghost ✠ descend and abide upon thee, and the Angel of the Lord keep thee, until thou comest to Holy Baptism.* As if the poor Creature were in mighty danger of being carried away by the Devil, before he could be Baptized, notwithstanding all the past Conjurations,
 and

and dreadful doings that had been made with him, and all the Crosses, together with the holy Oyl, and holy Spittle bestowed on the Infant. And lastly (to name no more additions, tho there are divers others) the Flax wherewith the anointed places are wiped is ordered to be burnt over a Pond of Water.

If those who are unacquainted with *our* Churches office of Baptism would, after the Reading of this of the *Romish* Church, consult *ours*, they will immediately acknowledge that no two things can well be more unlike than are *these* two Offices. And the like, as was said, may be seen in the rest, as those may perceive who, if they understand sorry Latine, will take the pains to compare *theirs* with *ours*. And whereas we asserted the same thing of *their* and *our* Forms of *Morning* and *Evening Prayers*, we might particularly instance in the *Litanies*. *Our Litany* (which I think, if comparisons may be allowed, is the choicest part of our Service), is more than any other part of the Liturgy condemned by Dissenters, as Savouring of Popish Superstition; But, as nothing but great Ignorance can make any man think it really doth so, so I am perswaded that the meer comparing it with *that* of the *Romanists* might incline the most prejudiced to call it a most *Protestant* piece of Devotion: For they shall find invocations of Saints and Angels to pray for them, the greater part of the *Popish Litany*. Next after the *Holy Trinity* St. *Mary* is there invoked first by name, then as the *Mother of God*, then as the *Virgin of Virgins*. Next to her, three Angels are invoked by name. Then all the *Angels and Arch-Angels* together. Then all the *holy Orders of Blessed Spirits*. Next *John the Baptist*. Next all the *Patriarchs and Prophets*. Next St. *Peter* and all the other *Apostles and Evangelists* by name. Then *Altogether*. Then all the *holy Disciples*

Disciples of our Lord, then all the *Holy Innocents*. Then the *Protomartyr St. Stephen*, and Ten other by *Name*. Then all the *Holy Martyrs* together. Then Seven more *Saints*. Then all the *Bishops and Confessors* together. Then all the *Holy Doctors*. Then Five more of their own great *Saints by Name*. Then all the *Holy Priests and Levites*. Then all the *Holy Monks and Hermites*. Then Seven *She-Saints by Name*. Then all the *Holy Virgins and Widows*. And *Lastly*, All the *He and She Saints* together.

But the brevity I am confined to in this Discourse will not permit me to abide any longer upon *this* Argument, of the vast distance between these two Churches in reference to their *Publick Prayers and Offices*.

Fourthly, We proceed to shew, that there is also no small distance between the Church of *England*, and that of *Rome*, in reference to the *Books they receive for Canonical*. This will be Immediately dispatched: For no more is to be said upon *this* subject, but that, whereas the Church of *Rome* takes all the *Apocryphal Books* into her Canon, the Church of *England*, like all other Protestant Churches, receives only those Books of the Old and New Testament for Canonical Scripture, as she declares in her Sixth Article, of whose Authority there was never any doubt in the Church. And she declareth concerning the *Apocryphal Books* in the same Article, citing *St. Hierom* for her Authority, *That the Church doth read them for Example of life, and Instruction of manners, but yet it doth not apply them to Establish any Doctrine*. And after the example of the *Primitive Church*, no more doth *ours*; and appoints the reading some of them on *Holy Days*, only upon the foresaid Account.

In the *Fifth* and *Last* place, The Church of *England* is at the greatest distance possible from the Church of

Rome, in reference to *the Authority on which they each found their whole Religion*. As to the Church of *Rome*, she makes her own Infallibility; the Foundation of Faith. For,

1. Our belief of the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures *themselves* must, according to *her Doctrine*, be founded upon her infallible Testimony.

2. As to that Prodigious deal which she hath added of *her own* to the Doctrines and Precepts of the Holy Scriptures, and which she makes as necessary to be believed and practised, as any matters of Faith and Practice contained in the Scriptures (and *more* necessary too, than many of them) the Authority of those things is founded upon her unwritten Traditions, and the Decrees of her Councils; which she will have to be no less inspired by the Holy Ghost, than were the *Prophets* and *Apostles* themselves.

But Contrariwise the Church of *England* doth,

1. Build the whole of *her Religion* upon the *Sole Authority* of Divine Revelation in the *Holy Scriptures*: And therefore she takes *every jot* thereof out of the Bible. She makes the Scriptures the *Complete Rule* of her *Faith*, and of her *Practice* too, in all matters necessary to Salvation, that is, in all the *parts* of Religion; nor is there any Genuine Son of *this Church*, that maketh any thing a part of his Religion that is not *plainly* contained in the Bible. Let us see what our Church declareth to this purpose, in her 16. Article, viz. *That Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith; or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation*. So that, as Mr. *Chillingworth*, saith, *THE BIBLE, THE BIBLE IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS*:

So

So you see the Bible is the Religion of the Protestant Church of *England*: Nor doth she fetch one *Title* of her Religion either out of unwritten Traditions, or Decrees of Councils. Notwithstanding she hath a great Reverence for those Councils which were not a Company of Bishops and Priests of the *Popes* packing, to serve his purposes, and which have best deserved the Name of *General Councils*, especially the *Four first*, yet her Reverence of them consisteth not in any opinion of their *Infallibility*: As appears by *Article 14. General Councils may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes; and when they be gathered together (for as much as they be an Assembly of Men, whereof all be not Governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may Err, and sometimes have Erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to Salvation, have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared (that is, manifestly proved) that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.*

Let us see again how our Church speaks of the matter in hand, *Article 20. The Church hath Power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith: And yet it is not Lawful for the Church to Ordain any thing that is contrary to Gods Word Written; neither may it so Expound one place of Scripture, that it be Repugnant to another. Wherefore although the Church be a Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ (that is, as the Jewish Church was so of the Canon of the Old Testament, by whose Tradition alone it could be known, what Books were Canonical, and what not, so the Catholick Christian Church, from Christ and his Apostles downwards is so, of the Canon of the New;)* Yet as it ought not to Decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to inforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation. If it be asked who

is to Judge, what is agreeable or contrary to Holy Writ ? tis manifest that Our Church leaves it to *every* Man to Judge for himself. But 'tis Objected, that 'tis to be acknowledged, that if the Church only claimed a Power to Decree *Rites and Ceremonies*; (that is, according to the general Rules of doing all things *Decently* and *Orderly*, and to *Edification*, which Power *all* Churches have ever Exercised) *this* may well enough consist with private Persons Liberty to Judge for themselves, but 'tis also said in the now Cited Article, that *the Church hath Authority in Controversies of Faith*; and accordingly *Our Church* hath Publisht 39 *Articles*, and requires of the Clergy, &c. Subscription to them. To this we Answer, that we shall make one Article Egregiously to Contradict another, and one and the same to Contradict it self, if we understand by the Authority in Controversies of Faith, which *Our Church* acknowledges *all* Churches to have, nay more than Authority to Oblige their Members to outward Submission, when their Decisions are such as Contradict not any of the Essentials of our Religion, whether they be *Articles of Faith*, or *Rules of Life*; not an Authority to Oblige them to assent to their Decrees, as infallibly true. But it is necessary to the maintaining of *Peace*, that all Churches should be invested with a Power to bind their Members to outward submission in the Case aforesaid; that is, when their supposed Errors are not of that Moment, as that 'tis of more pernicious Consequence to bear with them, than to break the Peace of the Church by opposing them. And as to the forementioned Subscription that is required to the 39 *Articles*, it is very Consistent with *Our Churches* giving all Men Liberty to Judge for *themselves*, and not Exercising Authority (as the Romish Church doth) over our *Faith*; for she requires

no Man to *believe* those Articles, but at worst only thinks it Convenient that none should receive *Orders*, or be admitted to Benefices, &c. but *such as do believe* them (not all as Articles of our *Faith*, but many as inferiour truths,) and requires Subscription to them as a Test, whereby to Judge who *doth* so believe them. But the Church of *Rome* requires all under Pain of Damnation, to *believe* all her long Bed-roul of Doctrines, which have only the Stamp of *her* Authority, and to believe them too as Articles of *Faith*; or to believe them with the *same* Divine Faith that we do the indisputable Doctrines of our Saviour and his Apostles.

For a proof hereof, the Reader may consult the Bull of Pope *Pius the Fourth*, which is to be found at the End of the Council of *Trent*. Herein it is Ordained that Profession of Faith shall be made and sworn, by all Dignitaries, Prebendaries, and such as have Benefices with Cure, Military Officers, &c. In the Form following :

I. N. *Do believe with a firm Faith, and do profess all and every thing contained in the Confession of Faith, which is used by the Holy Roman Church, viz. I believe in one God the Father Almighty, and so to the end of the Nicene Creed. I most firmly admit and Embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and the other Observances and constitutions of the said Church. Also the Holy Scriptures according to the Sense which our Holy Mother the Church hath held, and doth hold, &c. I profess also that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the New Law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary to the Salvation of Mankind; although all are not necessary to every individual Person, &c. I also admit and receive the Received and approved Rites of the Catholick Church, in the*
Solemn

Solemn Administration of all the foresaid Sacraments (of which I have given the Reader a taste) I Embrace and Receive all and every thing which hath been declared and defined concerning Original Sin, and Justification in the Holy Synod of Trent. I likewise profess that in the Mass a True, Proper and Propitiatory Sacrifice is Offered to God, for the quick and dead: And that the Body and Blood of Christ, is truly, really and substantially in the most Holy Eucharist, &c. I also Confess that whole and intire Christ, and the true Sacrament is received under one of the kinds only. I Constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detained are relieved by the Prayers of the Faithful. And in like manner that the Saints Reigning with Christ, are to be Worshipped and Invoked, &c. And that their Relicks are to be Worshipped. I most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, always a Virgin, and of the other Saints, are to be had and kept, and that due Honor and Worship is to be given to them. I Affirm also, that the Power of Indulgences is left by Christ in his Church, and that the use of them is very Salutiferous to Christian People. I acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I Profess and Swear Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the Successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Also all the other things delivered, decreed and declared by the Holy Canons, and Oecumenical Councils, and especially by the Holy Synod of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess: As also all things contrary to these, and all Heresies Condemned, Rejected and Anathematized by the Church, I, in like manner, Condemn, Reject and Anathematize. This true Catholick Faith, (viz. all this Stuff of their own, together with the Articles of the Creed) without which no Man can be Saved,

ved, which at this present I truly profess and sincerely hold, I will, God Assisting me, most constantly Retain and Confess intire and inviolate; and, as much as in me lies, will take Care, that it be held, taught and declared, by those that are under me, or the Care of whom shall be committed to me; I the same, N. do Profess Vow and Swear: So help me God, and the Holy Gospels of God. Who, when he Reads this, can forbear pronouncing the Reformation of the Church of England, a most Glorious Reformation?

2. As to the Motives our Church proposeth for our belief of the Doctrine of the *Holy Scriptures*, viz. that that Doctrine is of Divine Revelation, they are no other than such as are found in the Scriptures themselves, viz. the *Excellency* thereof, which consists in its being wholly adapted to the reforming of mens lives, and renewing their natures after the Image of God; and the *Miracles* by which it is confirmed. And as to the Evidence of the truth of the matters of Fact, viz. that there were such *Persons* as the Scriptures declare to have revealed Gods will to the World (such as *Moses*, our *Saviour Christ*, and *his Apostles*;) and that these Persons delivered such *Doctrine*, and Confirmed it by such *Miracles*, and that the Books of Scripture were written by those whose names they bear; I say as to the Evidence of the truth of these matters of Fact, our Church placeth it not in her own Testimony, or in the Testimony of any *Particular Church*, and much less that of *Rome*, but in the Testimony of the whole *Catholick Church* down to us from the time of the *Apostles*, and of *Universal Tradition*, taking in that of *Strangers* and *Enemies* as well as *Friends*, of *Jews* and *Pagans*, as well as *Christians*.

Secondly,

Secondly, We proceed to shew, that a Churches Symbolizing, or agreeing in some things with the Church of *Rome*, is no Warrant for Separation from the Church so agreeing. Agreement with the Church of *Rome* in things either in their *own nature good*, or made so by a Divine Precept, none of our Dissenting Brethren could ever imagine not to be an indispensable duty : Agreement with her in what is *in its own nature Evil*, or made so by a Divine Prohibition, none of us are so forsaken of all Modesty as to deny it to be an inexcusable sin. The Question therefore is, whether to agree with this Apostate Church, in somethings of an *indifferent* nature, be a Sin, and therefore a just ground for Separation from the Church so agreeing. But, by the way, if we should suppose that a Churches agreeing with the Church of *Rome* in some indifferent things is sinful, I cannot think that any of the more Sober Sort of Dissenters (and I despair of success in arguing with any but such) will thence infer, that Separation from the Church so agreeing is otherwise warrantable, than upon the account of those things being imposed as *necessary terms of Communion*. But I am so far from taking it for granted, that a Church is guilty of Sin in agreeing in some indifferent things with the Church of *Rome*, that I must needs profess, I have often wondred how *this* should become a Question : Seeing whatsoever is of an indifferent nature, as it is not *Commanded*, so neither is it *Forbidden* by any Moral or Positive Law ; and *where there is no Law*, the Apostle saith, *there is no transgression ; Sin* being according to *his* definition, *the transgression of the Law*. And whereas certain *Circumstances* will make things that in *themselves* are neither *duties* nor *sins*, to be either duties or sins, and to fall by *Consequence* under some Divine Command or Prohibition, I have admired

admired how *this Circumstance of an indifferent thing's being used by the Church of Rome* can be thought to alter the Nature of that thing, and make it cease to be indifferent and become sinful. But that it doth so, is endeavoured to be proved by that general Prohibition to the *Israelites*, of *imitating the doings of the Egyptians and Canaanites*, in those Words, Lev. 18. 2. *After the doings of the Land of Egypt wherein ye dwell, shall ye not do, and after the doings of the Land of Canaan whither I bring you, shall ye not do, neither shall ye walk in their Ordinances.* This place divers of the Defenders of Nonconformity have laid great weight upon, as a proof of the Sinfulness of Symbolizing with the Church of Rome, Even in indifferent things. But I chuse to forbear the *Naming* of any whose Arguings I purpose to enquire into, because I would prevent (if it be possible) the least suspicion in the Readers, that I design in this Performance to expose any Mans weakness in *particular*, or that I am therein Acted by any *Personal Piques*.

Now then, as to the Text now Cited ; Not to insist upon the Fallaciousness of Arguing, without mighty caution, from Laws given by *Moses* to the *Israelites*, so as to infer the Obligation of *Christians*, who are under a dispensation so different from theirs, and in Circumstances so vastly differing from those they were in ; I say, not to insist upon the Fallaciousness of this way of Arguing, (which all considering Persons must needs be aware of) if *this* general Prohibition be not at all to be limited, then it will follow from thence, that the *Israelites* might have no usages *whatsoever* in common with the *Egyptians* or *Canaanites* ; and therefore, in as general terms as the Prohibition runs, our Brethren must needs acknowledge that there is a restriction therein intended: it being

the most absurd thing to Imagine, that the *Israelites* were so bound up by God, as to be Obligated to an unlikeness to those People in *all* their Actions: For, as the *Apostles* said of the *Christians*, if they were never to Company with Wicked Men, *they must needs go out of the World*, we may say of the *Israelites* in reference to *this* Case of theirs, *they then must needs have gone out of the World*. Now if this general Prohibition, *after their doings ye shall not do*, be to be limited and restrained, what way have we to do it, but by considering the Context, and confining the restriction to those particulars Prohibited in the *following* verses. But I need not shew that the particulars forbidden in all these, *viz.* from *v. 5th.* to the *24th.* were not things of an *indifferent* Nature, but *Incestuous Copulations*, and other *abominable Acts of Uncleannefs*. And God doth *Expressly* enough thus restrain that general Prohibition, in the *24th. v.* in these Words: *Defile not your selves in any of these things, for in all these the Nations are Defiled, which I cast out before you.*

But those that alledge this Text to the foresaid purpose, will not hear of the general Proposition's being thus limited by the Context (as apparent as it is, that it necessarily must) because, say they, we find that God forbids the *Israelites* in other places, to imitate *Heathens*, in things of an *Indifferent* and *Innocent* Nature.

To this I Answer, First, That supposing this were so, it doth not from thence follow, that God intended to forbid such imitations in *this* place, the contrary being so manifest as we have seen. But,

Secondly, That God hath any where prohibited the *Israelites* to Symbolize with *Heathens*, in things of a meer Indifferent and Innocent Nature; I mean that he hath made it Unlawful to them, to observe any such Customs of the Heathens, meerly upon the account

count of their being *like them*, is a very great mistake: Which will appear by considering those places which are produced for it. One is, Deut. 14. 1. *You shall not Cut your selves, nor make any baldness between your Eyes for the dead.* Now, as to the former of these prohibited things, who seeth not that 'tis *Unnatural*, and therefore not indifferent? And as to the latter, viz. the disfiguring of themselves by Cutting off their Eyebrows, this was not merely an indifferent thing neither: It being a Custom at Funerals much disbecoming the People of God, which would make them look, *as if they sorrowed for the dead as Men without hope.*

Another place insisted upon for the same purpose is Lev. 19. 19. *Thou shalt not let thy Cattle Gender with a divers kind, thou shalt not sow thy Ground with mingled seed, nor shall a Garment of Linnen and Woollen come upon thee.* Now these three, 'tis said, are things of so indifferent a Nature, that none can be more indifferent. I answer, 'Tis readily granted. But where is it said, that these things were forbidden because the *Heathens* used them? *Maimonides* indeed (as I learn from *Grotius*) saith, that the *Agyptians* used these mixtures of *Seeds*, and of *Linnen and Woollen* in many of their Magical Exploits; but 'tis universally acknowledged that *these* things, among many other, were forbidden to the *Jews*, as Mystical instructions in Moral Duties.

I have found no other Text made use of to prove meer indifferent things to have been forbidden the *Israelites*, only in regard of *Heathens* using them, which make more for this purpose than these two do, nor hardly another that makes so much. But if there were never so many, it is not worth our while to concern our selves now with them, because, though we

should suppose a great number of instances of such things as were forbidden those People, for no other reason, but because the *Egyptians* or *Canaanites* used them, yet this would signifie nothing to the proving Our Churches Symbolizing with that of *Rome* in indifferent things to be Unlawful, because there is not the like reason, why in such things we may not Symbolize with Papists, that there was why the *Jews* should be forbidden to Symbolize in such with those Heathens. For there could not be too great a distance and unlikeness between *those* People and *these* in their usages, in regard of their strangely Vehement inclination to their Superstitious and Idolatrous Practices. And upon this account, the distance was made wider (as our Brethren themselves will acknowledge) between the *Jews* and the *Pagans*, than it ought to be between *Christians* and *them*, or between Protestants and Papists. And we find that the distance that God made between the *Jews* and Heathens, as very wide as it was, was not wide enough to preserve the *Jews* from being very often (and that generally too) infected with their Superstitions, and various kinds of Idolatry: No, though they frequently paid most dear for these their Wicked Imitations of them. But, thanks be to God, there is no such inclination in the Members of Our Church to go over to that of *Rome*, nor hath any such inclination been observ'd ever since the Reformation. And where *one* of our Communion hath Revolted out of Love to Popery, (of those few Comparatively who have play'd the Apostates) we have cause to believe that *many* have so done meerly upon the score of interest. And I need not say, that such Persons would not have been preserved from Apostasy, by our Churches being set at the widest distance possible from the Church of *Rome*, in indifferent things. Nay 'tis
so

so far from being true, that there is a general inclination in our Protestants to Popery, that nothing is better known, or hath of late been more observed, than the greatest Antipathy and Aversion thereto imaginable in the generality. Upon which account, I say, the foresaid and the like Prohibitions to the Jewish Nation (although they should be understood in the sense of our Dissenting Brethren) can by no parity of reason be obliging to us Protestant Christians.

And indeed most of them have seemed of late years to be pretty well aware of this, and therefore divers of their Writers have limited the unlawfulness of Symbolizing with the Romish Church, to things that have been *abused notoriously, in Idolatrous and grossly Superstitious Services*. And that our Symbolizing with that Church in any *such* things is Unlawful, they endeavour to demonstrate both by Scripture Precepts and Examples.

First, They endeavour to demonstrate this by Scripture Precepts. And if any such Precept as *this* could be produced, *That all such things as have been notoriously abused and Polluted in Idolatrous or grossly Superstitious Services, should by all be abolished and laid aside*, there could be no place left for dispute about this matter; and I doubt not but we should all of us express as great Zeal, as our Brethren do, for the abolishing of all such things. But no such express and unlimited Precept is pretended, but the chief of those Texts from whence our Brethren endeavour to Infer this Proposition, *That it is the will of God, that all things so polluted should be utterly destroyed and laid aside*, are these following, *Isaiah 30. 22. Te shall Defile also the covering of thy Graven Images of Silver, and the Ornament of thy Molten Images of Gold: Thou shalt Cast them away as a Menstruous Cloath, thou shalt say unto it, Get thee hence.* Deut.

Deut. 7. 25, 26. *The Graven Images of their Gods shall ye burn with Fire, thou shalt not desire the Silver or Gold that is on them, nor take it unto thee, lest thou be snared therein: for it is an Abomination to the Lord thy God. Neither shalt thou bring an Abomination into thy House, lest thou be a cursed thing like it, but thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it, for it is a Cursed thing.*

Jude. 23.—*bating even the Garment Spotted with the Flesh.*

Revel. 2. 14. *I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the Doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a Stumbling block before the Children of Israel, to Eat things Sacrificed unto Idols, &c. v. 20. Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that Woman Jezebel, which calleth her self a Prophetess, to teach and to seduce my Servants to commit Fornication, and to Eat things Sacrificed to Idols.*

Now to their alledging of these Texts to prove the foresaid Proposition, I reply :

First, That the *last* of them is altogether impertinent. For the eating of things offered to Idols condemned in those two verses, is nothing better than joyning and complying with Idolaters, and Communicating in Idol-worships. Which the vile Gnostiques held they might do (and accordingly practised this doctrine) to avoid persecution : Which abominable Sect arose in the Church (as we learn from *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, *Eusebius* &c.) even in the Apostles times, of which *Simon Magus* was the first Founder. But *St. Paul* hath given us his judgment concerning Eating of things offered to Idols, without any respect to Idols in Eating, in *1 Cor. 8 chap. viz.* That upon no other account but that of *Scandal* it is unlawful.

And

And the like he hath done, 1 Cor. 10. 27, 28, 29. *If any of them that believe not bid you to a Feast, and you be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you, Eat, making no question for Conscience sake. But if any man say unto you, this is offered in Sacrifice unto Idols, Eat not, for his sake who shewed it, and for Conscience sake, &c. Conscience I say not thine own, but of the others: For why is my liberty judged of another mans Conscience? That is, so as to make a thing indifferent in it self, simply unlawful to me. But the Stating of this case of Scandal is the business of anothers Pen, to which I refer those who need satisfaction in this matter.*

Secondly, As to those words of St. Jude—hating even the Garment spotted by the Flesh: Nothing more can possibly be gathered from them, than what we and all Christians must acknowledge, as well as our Brethren viz. that we ought to be as Cautious of exposing our selves unnecessarily to temptations to sin, as we naturally are of touching the Garments of infected Persons. But if the Text had run thus—hating even the Garment that was once spotted with the Flesh, or once fouled with a plague Sore, though it be never so well cleansed from infection, then I must confess it would be an argument for our Brethrens purpose, we could make no reply to.

Thirdly, As to the two places cited out of the Old Testament, they indeed not only serve to prove, that it was God's will that the Jews should destroy Idols, but also the Appurtenances of them. And the reason of these Precepts being given to those People hath already been shewed, viz. because they were so strangely, so prodigiously addicted to the Superstitions and Idolatry of their Heathen-Neighbours. But if these and the like places should really make for our Brethrens design in Citing them, and do prove that Christians are obliged to

to destroy, or cast away, all things notoriously defiled in grossly Superstitious and Idolatrous services, they would certainly prove *more*, than the more sober sort of Dissenters do desire they should. For they do not object against the lawfulness of our using the *Churches*, or *Fonts* or *Bells*, which heretofore were most notoriously so defiled by the Papists. But if these texts speak it to be the duty of *Christians* as well as *Jews* to destroy all such things, then 'tis manifest that down we must with all our Old *Churches* &c. or we are guilty of an inexcusable violation of the Divine Law. And to except such things as these, after they have Evinced from such Scriptures our obligation to destroy all things notoriously polluted in grossly Superstitious and Idolatrous services, seems to be making too too bold with the express Laws of God, which make no such exceptions, nor doth the forementioned reason of them imply any such. And therefore they have been highly condemned for making such like exceptions by others of their Brethren who have Attained to a higher dispensation; And considering this Concession that such things as the fore named may still be lawfully used, as also the Concessions of a nameless Author in his famous Book call'd *Nehushtan*, that *no Creature of God is to be refused, nor any necessary or profitable devices of men need be sent packing upon the account of their having been much abused to the foresaid ends*, I appeal to their own more sedate thoughts, whether all that can be concluded from such Scriptures is any more than *this*, that things so abused ought to be destroyed or abolished, by all who have power to do it, in *some certain case or cases*, and not merely for this reason, *because they have been so abused*. *This*, I presume, none of *us* will deny, and if *they* will acknowledge it, as they must do if they will stand to those their Concessions, they will be Constrained to give up this cause.

I will conclude the Argument in hand with the judgment of that Eminent reformer Mr. *Calvin* whose Authority goes farther with the generality of our Brethren, than, I think, any *Mans* next to the Apostles. Saith he upon the *Second Commandment*, *I know that the Jews, throughout the time of their Pædagogy, were Commanded to destroy the Groves and Altars of Idolaters, not by vertue of the Moral Law, but by an Appendix in the Judicial or Politick Law, which did oblige that People for a time only, but it binds not Christians: And therefore we do not in the least scruple whether we may Lawfully use those Temples, Fonts and other Materialls, which have been heretofore abused to Idolatrous and Superstitious uses. I acknowledge indeed, that we ought to remove such things, as seem to nourish Idolatry, upon supposition that we our selves in opposing too violently things in their own Nature indifferent, be not too Superstitious. It is equally Superstitious to Condemn things indifferent as Unholy, and to Command them as if they were Holy.* Thus you see Mr. *Calvins* sense agreeth exactly with *Ours*, touching this Point of Controversie between us and many of our Dissenting Brethren.

Secondly, They endeavour also to make out this Doctrine of theirs by *Scripture-Examples*. There are four or five of these Examples insisted upon, but I will trouble the Reader with considering only *one* of them; both because it is the Principal Example, and that which they lay most stress on, and because the reply I shall make to *this*, will be as satisfactory in reference to the rest. It is that of *Hezekiah* his breaking in Pieces the Brazen Serpent that *Moses* had made, because the Children of *Israel* burnt Incense to it, *2 Kings* 18. 4. Now, saith a certain Noted Author, *what Example is more considerable than that of Hezekiah, who not only abolished such Monuments of Idolatry, as at their first In-*

stitution

stitution were but Men's inventions, but brake down also the Brazen Serpent (though Originally set up at Gods Command) when once he saw it abused to Idolatry. And he adds, that this deed of Hezekiah Pope Stephen doth greatly Praise (citing Wolphius for it) and professeth that it is set before us for our imitation; that when our Predecessors have wrought some things, which might have been without fault in their time, and afterwards they are converted into Error and Superstition, they may be quickly destroyed by us who come after them.

Which soever of the Stephens this was, he was a strangely Honest Pope; especially had he Practised according to *this* his Profession, and his Infallibilityship had judg'd Impartially of Errors and Superstitions. And he cites *Farellus* (out of an Epistle of *Calvins*) for this saying, *That Princes and Magistrates should learn by this Example of Hezekiah, what they should do with those Significant Rites of Mens devising which have turned to Superstition.* And he farther adds, *that the Bishop of Winchester (in his Sermon on Phil. 2. 10.) acknowledgeth, that whatsoever is taken up at the injunction of Men, when it is drawn to Superstition, cometh under the Compass of the Brazen Serpent, and is to be abolished.* And he saith he Excepteth nothing from this Example, but only things of Gods own Prescribing. But 'tis strange if a Bishop should not except Churches, and some other things besides which are of an humane make; and as strange if there be nothing going before or coming after this acknowledgment, to lead us to a better understanding of it. We will not question our Authors faithfulness in Transcribing it, but wish he had told us which Bishop of Winchester this is, and in what page of his Sermon we might find this Acknowledgment.

But that this Fact of King *Hezekiah* will not prove, that whatsoever hath been notoriously defiled in Idolatrous or grossly Superstitious services ought to be abolished, and much less, that the not abolishing some such things is a good ground for Separation from the Church that neglects so to do, will, I presume, sufficiently appear by these following considerations.

First, The Brazen Serpent was not only a thing defiled in Idolatrous services, but it was made an *Idol* it self.

Secondly, It was not only a thing that had *once* been made an Idol, or Object of Religious Worship, but it was Actually so at that time when it was destroyed. Nay it was at that instant an Object of the *most gross* kind of Idolatry: It being not only *bowed down* to, but had likewise *Incense burnt* to it; *this* being a Rite which is never used in meer *Civil* Worship, like *bowing the Knee*, &c. but so proper and peculiar to *Divine* Worship, that no Rite is *more* so. Nay farther:

Thirdly, It was not thus notoriously Idolized by some few of the People, but the People were *Generally* lapsed into this Idolatry: As the Text plainly sheweth. Nay:

Fourthly, There was as little hope as could be of the Peoples being reclaimed from this Idolatry, while the Idol was in being: Seeing that of a long time they had been accustomed thereunto. For 'tis said, that *unto those days* the Children of *Israel* burnt Incense to it; which speaks it to have been not only a *Custom*, but a Custom also of a *long standing*.

Fifthly, Although it had been only a thing defiled in Idolatrous services, yet we freely grant that it ought to have been destroyed, or removed from the Peoples sight, if the continuance of it in their View were like to be a *Snare* to them, and a Temptation to Idolatry:

Since now the use of it was ceased, for which, by Divine appointment, it was first Erected. But there was no necessity for this, upon supposition, that it had ceased to be abused for any considerable time, and there were no appearance of an inclination in the People to abuse it again. And no doubt, all things of an indifferent Nature, that have formerly been abused to Idolatry or Superstition, ought to be taken away by the Governours, whensoever they find their People again inclined so to abuse them ; at least, if such abuse cannot Probably be prevented by *other means*.

Sixthly, But had *Hezekiah* suffered the Brazen Serpent still to stand, no doubt private Persons (who have no authority to make publick Reformati^ons) might Lawfully have made use of it, to put them in mind of, and affect them with the wonderful mercy of God expressed by it to their Fore-Fathers ; notwithstanding that many had not only formerly, but did at that very nick of time, make an Idol of it. And much more might they have Lawfully continued in the Communion of the Church, so long as there was no constraint laid upon *them* to joyn with them in their Idolatry : As we do not read of any that separated from the Church while the Brazen Serpent was permitted to stand, as wofully abused as it was by the generality.

I will also conclude this head with the sense of Mr. *Calvin* concerning Rites used (and consequently superstitiously abused) by the Papi^sts, expressed in these Words ; *Let not any think me so austere, or bound up, as to forbid a Christian without any exception, to accommodate himself to the Papi^sts in any Ceremony or Observance : for it is not my purpose to Condemn any thing, but what is clearly Evil and openly Vicious.* To which may be added many other such like sayings of this Learned Person.

*Calv. de
sanda Supersti-
tione, &c.*

And

And thus much shall suffice to be discoursed upon our second general head, *viz. That a Church's Symbolizing in some things with the Church of Rome is no Warrant for Separation from the Church so Symbolizing.*

We now proceed, in the *Third* and last place, to shew, That the Agreement which is between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome* is in no wise such as will make Communion with the Church of *England* unlawful.

We have shewed, what a vastly wide Distance and Disagreement there is between the Church of *England* and that of *Rome* : And we have sufficiently (though with the greatest brevity) made it apparent, that a Church's symbolizing or agreeing in some things with the Church of *Rome*, and those such too as she hath abused in idolatrous and grossly superstitious Services, is no just ground for Separation from the Church so agreeing ; And we have answered the Chief of those Arguments which have been brought for the Confirmation of the contrary Doctrine. And now, from what hath been discoursed, it may with the greatest ease be prov'd, that *those* things wherein our *own* Church particularly, agreeth with the *Romish* Church, do none of them speak such an Agreement therewith, as will justify Separation from our Church's Communion.

Now the particulars wherein *our* Church symbolizeth with that of *Rome*, which our Dissenters take offence at, and make a pretence for Separation (though *all* Dissenters are not offended at *all* of them, and much less so offended as to make them all a pretence for Separation) are principally *these* following.

First,

First, The Government of our Church by *Bishops*.

Secondly, Our Churches prescribing a *Liturgy*, or Set-Forms of Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Publick Offices.

Thirdly, A Liturgy so contrived as that of our Church is.

Fourthly, Certain *Rites* of our Church. Particularly, The *Surplice*, the *Cross in Baptism*, the *Gesture of Kneeling at the Communion*, the *Ring in Marriage*, and the *Observation of certain Holy-days*. And to all these I shall speak very succinctly, the limits I am confined to not permitting me to enlarge much upon any of them.

But I must first premise concerning them all in the general these following things.

First, That I take it for granted, that they are all indifferent in their *own nature* : That there is nothing of Viciousness or Immorality in any of them to make them unlawful. I know no body so unreasonable as not to grant this.

Secondly, That there is no *Express* positive Law of God against any of these things. I do not know of any such Law objected against any one of them. And therefore if all, or any of them are unlawful, they must be made so either by Consequences drawn from Divine Laws, or certain Circumstances attending them.

Thirdly, That I am concerned in this Discourse to vindicate them from being unlawful, upon the account onely of this *one* Circumstance, *viz. Our symbolizing with the Church of Rome in them*. Now then,

First, As to the Government of our Church by *Bishops* : This is so far from being an *Unlawful* symbolizing with the Church of *Rome*, that we have most clear

clear Evidence of its being a symbolizing with her in an *Apostolical Institution*. And what eminent Divines of the *Presbyterial Party* have acknowledg'd (and is too evident to be denied or *doubted* by any, who are not wholly ignorant of Church History) is sufficient (I should think) to satisfy unprejudiced persons concerning the truth of *this*: And *that* is, that *this* was the Government of all Churches in the World from the Apostles times, for about 1500 years together. Beza, in his Treatise of a *Threefold kind of Episcopacy*, Divine, Humane, and Satanical, asserts concerning the second (which is that which we call *Apostolical*) that of *this kind is to be understood whatsoever we read concerning the Authority of Bishops*, in *Ignatius*, and other more Antient Writers. And the Famous *Peter Du Moulin* in his Book of the *Pastoral Office*, written in defence of the *Presbyterial Government* acknowledgeth that *presently after the Apostles times, or even in their time (as Ecclesiastical story witnesseth) it was ordained, that in every City one of the Presbytery should be called a Bishop, who should have preheminance over his Collegues; to avoid Confusion, which oft times ariseth out of Equality. And truly, saith he, this Form of Government all Churches everywhere received.* Mr. Calvin saith in his *Institution of Christian Religion*, *Quibus docendi munus injunctum erat, &c. Those to whom was committed the Office of Teaching, they called them all Presbyters. These Elected out of their number in each City one, to whom in a special manner they gave the Title of Bishop; lest Strife and Contention (as it commonly happeneth) should arise out of Equality.* And in his Epistle to Arch-Bishop Cranmer, he thus accosts him, *Illustissime Domine, & Ornatissime Praesul, &c. Most Illustrious Sir, and most Honourable Prelate, and by me heartily Reverenced:* And tells him, that

L. 4. cap. 4.
§. 2.
if

if he might be serviceable to the Church of England, he would not think much of passing over ten Seas, for that purpose. Again in his Epistle to the King of Poland, he thus speaks of Patriarchs and Arch-Bishops; The Ancient Church did appoint Patriarchs and Primates in every Province, that by this bond of Concord the Bishops might the better be knit together.

In short, (for I must not proceed farther upon this vastly large head of discourse I know not how our Brethren will defend the Apostolical Institution of the Observation of the *Lords Day*, while they contend that *this* of *Episcopacy*, cannot be concluded from the uninterrupted Tradition of the Catholick Church, for so many Centuries from the time of the Apostles. Nor how those that Separate from *our Church* upon the account of its *Government by Bishops*, and call it Antichristian, can defend the Lawfulness of Communicating with any Church in Christendom for about 1500 years together.

Secondly, As to Our Churches prescribing a Liturgy or set Forms of Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other publick Offices; It is easy to shew that Symbolizing with the Church of Rome herein is so far from being culpable, and much more from being a just ground of Separation from our Church, that 'tis highly Commendable: For as herein Our Church no less Symbolizeth with the Primitive Church, than with that of Rome, as she is now Constituted (nothing being more certainly known than that Liturgies are of most Ancient standing) so nothing is more highly expedient, for the due management of the publick Worship of God, than the use of a Liturgy. And, indeed, instead of Expedient I might say Necessary; it being impossible to secure the performance of publick Worship with that solemnity and gravity that becomes it, in a Church where

where its Ministers are wholly left free to the Exercise of Extemporary invention. But the handling of *this* Argument is the business of another new Discourse, to which I refer the Reader. I shall therefore conclude it with a citation out of *Calvins* Epistle *Ad Protectorem Angliæ*; saith he, *As to a Form of Prayers and Ecclesiastical Rites, I do very much approve of the publishing of a fixed one, from which it may not be Lawful for the Pastors to depart in the exercise of their Function: Thereby to provide against the simplicity and unskilfulness of some, and that the consent of all the Churches with each other may more certainly appear: And lastly to put a barr to the skipping Levity of others, who Affect certain innovations. And therefore* (as he proceeds) *Statum esse Catechismum oportet, Statam Sacramentorum Administrationem, publicam item precum Formulam, there ought to be an Established Catechism, an Office for the Administration of the Sacraments Established, and also a Publick Form of Prayers.* And he accordingly composed a Liturgy, to be used by the Ministers in *Geneva*, on Sundays and Holydays. And the Exiles that resided at *Geneva*, in the days of *Queen Mary*, did by his advice draw up a Liturgy, which was Printed in the *English* Tongue, in the year 1556.

Thirdly, As to a Liturgy so contrived as that of *our* Church is, what hath been said of the vast distance between *our* Church and that of *Rome* herein, is sufficient to shew that there can be no warrantable pretence for Separation from *our* Church, upon the account of the Symbolizing that is between these two Churches in *this* particular. But we will particularly consider those instances of agreement between *ours* and the *Romane* Service which are most offensive to our brethren; they are especially these four.

1. Our many short Prayers, which some have too lightly called *short Cuts, and Shreddings, and rather Wisbes than Prayers*. But there needs no other reply hereunto, than *that* our Learned *Hooker* gives, *viz.* That *St. Augustin* saith, *Epist.* 121. *That the Brethren in Egypt are reported to have many Prayers, but every of them very short, as if they were Darts thrown out with a kind of sudden quickness, lest that Vigilant and erect attention of mind, which in Prayer is very necessary, should be Wasted and dulled through Continuance, if their Prayers were few and long. But that which St. Austlin alloweth they Condemn, &c.* He might as well have said, what that good Father *Commendeth*, nay his words imply *no small commendation*. And I fear not to appeal to all Pious Souls, who without prejudice joyn with us in our Publick Prayers, whether they find the shortness of many of them an *hindrance* or *help* to their devotion. I don't question but that such will readily acknowledge that they find it an *help*. And therefore, in my weak judgment, our Symbolizing with the Church of *Rome* in this particular, is Symbolizing with her in that which is highly commendable, as tis so also in *that* wherein *she* Symbolizeth with very Ancient Churches.

2. Another instance is, *The Peoples bearing a part with the Minister in divine Service*. But Mr. *Baxter* hath said enough in his *Christian Directory* on Q. 83. not only to vindicate the *Lawfulness*, but the *Fitness and Expediency* also, of Symbolizing herein with the Church of *Rome*. Saith he,

1. *The Scripture no where forbids it.*

2. *If the People may do this in the Psalms in Metre, there can be no reason given, but they may Lawfully do it in Prose.*

3. *The Primitive Christians were so full of Zeal and Love of Christ, that they would have taken it for an injury, or quenching of the Spirit, to have been wholly restrained from bearing a part in the Praises of the Church.*

4. *The use of the Tongue keeps awake the mind, and stirs up Gods graces in his Servants.*

5. *It was the decay of Zeal in the People that first shut out the Responses: while they kept up the Ancient Zeal, they were inclined to take their part vocally in the Worship. Though I were under no obligation of brevity, I should add nothing more of mine own about this matter.*

3. Another instance of this Nature is, *the taking of some of the Collects out of the Mass-Book.* But to this I give this, I hope as *satisfactory as short Answer, viz.* That these Prayers are either *good or bad*; if they are *bad ones*, they may not be used, though they were *not* in the Mass-Book, and upon *that account* the use of them would be Unlawful, not upon the account of our *Symbolizing in them with the Roman Church.* But if they are all *good ones*, as they are *very good*, then from what hath been said 'tis Evident that *this Symbolizing cannot make them bad*; and 'tis a hard case that we should not be allowed the use of whatsoever is *good* in their Service. Our Brethren will allow of reading the same *Scriptures* that they do, and why then should they disallow of using what perfectly *agreeth* with Scripture, because they use it? Our departure from *them* was designed to be a *Reformation*, not a total *Destruction* and *Extirpation*.

4. The last instance is, *The appointing of Lessons out of the Apocryphal Books.* But herein we Symbolize with the *Primitive Church*, rather than with this of *Rome*: For (as hath been shewed out of the 6. Ar

Article of our Church) they are not appointed to be read as *Canonical* Scripture, and we perfectly agree with the Primitive Church, in reading them for *Example of life, and Instruction of manners, but not for the Establishing of any Doctrine*: Which, in that Article, is shewed from St. *Hierom*, to have been the Practice of that Church. And besides they are not now appointed to be ordinarily on *Sundays* read in Our Churches, but only on *Holydays*.

These I take to be the chief of those instances of *our* Churches Symbolizing with that of *Rome*, in the Composure of the Liturgy, that Our Dissenters are offended at: And as for their other Objections of this kind they are as easily answered. And I most sincerely profess, that tis not to me imaginable that any thing better than Extreme prejudice can make any Man a Separatist from Our Communion upon such accounts as these: As also, that I cannot understand how any devout and pious Souls that come to our Publick Prayers without prejudice, can find themselves in the least tempted not to joyn in them heartily with the Congregation. Absolute perfection is not to be expected in any thing of a human make, but if all would read Our Liturgy with that Candour they use in reading the Books of those they have a good opinion of, as I am sure they could think nothing *intolerable* therein, so am I as sure, they would freely acknowledg it to be exceedingly well adapted to the design of it, *viz.* the exciting of Devotion, and that good temper of mind, that is necessary to Our Worshipping of God *in Spirit and in Truth*. I am certain, the experience of very many as excellent Christians as this Age can *boast* of, do bear me witness, that this is no lavish commendation of Our Prayers. Dr. *Taylor* that Blessed Martyr gave

gave this Testimony to Our Liturgy, *There was set forth by the most Innocent King Edward (for whom God be Praised everlastingly) the whole Church Service with great deliberation and advice of the best Learned Men in the Realm; and Authorized by the whole Parliament, and received and Publisht gladly by the whole Realm; which Book was never reformed but once, and yet by that one Reformation it was as fully perfected, according to the Rules of Our Christian Religion in every behalf, that no Christian Conscience could be Offended, with any thing therein contained. I mean of that Book Reformed.* What then would he have thought of it, had he lived to see it twice more Reformed, as it hath been since.

Acts and Mo-
numents. p.
1696.

Lastly, I proceed to the forenamed *Rites and Ceremonies* of Our Church, in which our Symbolizing with Popery is so much Condemned, and made a pretence for Separation. But before I come to particulars, I will observe in the general, that the distance Our Church keeps from that of *Rome* in the imposition of Ceremonies is infinitely greater than her Agreement therein with her. For, as those imposed by *our Church* (as hath been already said) are exceeding few, not the *hundredth* part scarcely of those imposed by the *Roman Church*, so doth not *our Church* impose them (as the other doth) on the Consciences of her Members as things of *necessity*, as *parts* of Religion or meritorious Services, as hath been proved out of the Articles. Now then,

1. As to the *Surplice*, our Church requires not the wearing of *this* Garment, as an Holy Vestment, like the Priestly Garments under the Old Law, but merely for the sake of Order and Uniformity: whereas in the Church of *Rome* a Surplice may not be worn till 'tis hallowed

hallowed in a solemn manner by the Bishop, or some one by his Allowance (as may be seen in the *Missal*) with divers prayers, that it may defend him who wears it from the Assaults of the Devil; the prayers being accompanied with a number of Crossings, and, in fine, the Surplice besprinkled with Holy Water, in the name of the Blessed Trinity. But, I say, in our Church 'tis used only as a Garment of distinction, no more holiness is placed in it, than in the *Hoods* worn over it meerly for distinction of degrees: And the *White* is preferred before any other Colour, because it was a very antient Custom in the Primitive Church for the Ministers to Officiate in White Garments. *Beza* saith of the Surplice, *These linnen Garments we do not so stick at, that we would have the progress of the Word of God hindered in the least for them.* And we might shew that Mr. *Calvin* much blamed Contending with Authority about the wearing this Garment: Particularly in his Epistle to *Bullinger*. And since all the Popish abuse of this Garment is perfectly removed, I know not why all Ministers should not be of *their* mind; and much less can I imagine, why those who are not obliged to wear it, should be affrighted from our Churches by the meer sight of so Innocent a thing.

Contra West-
phalum. vol. 1.
P. 255.

2. As to the *Cross* in Baptism; Our Church holds so little Conformity with the Papists herein, that in no one thing of an Indifferent nature can our Symbolizing with them be less scandalous. Dr. *Burges* in his defence of Dr. *Morton*, Sheweth, that we hold no Conformity with the Papists in the use thereof, either in the time when, or place where, or manner how, or end whereto. The Minister with us as he there sheweth) may not Cross Himself, or the People, or Font, Water, Communion Table, or Cups, or the Bread and Wine,

P. 416, &c.

or

or any *other* of Gods Ordinances : All which in Popery the Priest is bound to do, for their Consecration, or blessing of *himself*, or *them*, as without which nothing is Consecrated. The Child to be Baptized with *us*, may not be Crossed before Baptism on the *Forehead*, *Breast*, or any part, which in Popery, the Priest must do, to drive away the Devil, and make the Efficacy of that Sacrament more easy and strong, as they teach. After Baptism, the Minister may not with *us* Cross the Children with Oyl or Chrism, or *without*, on the Crown of the Head, as in Popery is required, to give them their full Christendom, lest they should die before *Confirmation*. Yea at *Confirmation*, the Minister is not to make the sign of the Cross on the Forehead with Chrism or *without*, which is enjoined in Popery as an Essential part of the Sacrament (as they call it) of *Confirmation*. Nay (as he proceeds) if the Child be in danger of present death, and not like to live to make profession of Christ Crucified, the Minister is directed not to use the sign of the Cross; that all may know, that we hold it not to be either Operative upon the Child, or at all necessary to the Efficacy of the Lord's Sacrament, but do only retain it, according to the first and best intention, as an outward badg of the Constant profession of Christ Crucified. And where as 'tis said in the 30 *Canon*, that *by this lawful Ceremony and honorable badg, this Child is dedicated to the service of Christ*, the Doctor declareth that he hath good warrant to assure those who are offended at that Explication, that the word *dedicated* doth there import no more, than *declared* by that Ceremony to be *dedicated*, viz. by the foregoing Baptism : like as the Priest is said to have *cleansed* the Leper, whom he only *declareth* to be clean. Lev 14. 11. And tis manifest from the account given of the imposing of this Ceremony in that

Canon

Resp. ad

Ead. w. p. 324.

Canon, that this Phrase cannot otherwise be understood. I shall not need to add any thing more about *this Ceremony*, after I have said, that our Church retains it not in imitation of the Church of *Rome*, but of the *Primitive Christians*, they thereby (to use the Words of the foresaid *Canon*) making an outward profession even to the astonishment of the *Jews*, that they were not ashamed to acknowledge him for their Lord and Saviour, who died for them upon the Cross, &c. And (as it follows) this use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, washeld in the *Primitive Church*, as well by the *Greeks*, as the *Latins*, with one consent and great applause, &c. I conclude with *Bezas* judgment of the Lawfulness of this Ceremony. Saith he, *I know many to have retained the use of the sign of the Cross, the Adoration of the Cross being taken away: Let them, as is meet, use their own Liberty.* But in *our Church*, not only the Adoration of the Cross but likewise all *Superstition* in the use of it is perfectly abolished. How then can it be thought such a Symbolizing with the Church of *Rome* as may warrant Separation from our Communion?

3. As to the Ceremony of *Kneeling at the Communion*: If our Churches Declaration at the end of the Communion Service, will not vindicate her from an Unlawful Symbolizing with *Rome* herein, I have nothing to say in her defence. The declaration is *this*, Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lords Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same Kneeling (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such Prophanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue) yet lest the same Kneeling should by any Persons, either out of Ignorance and Infirmary, or out of Malice and Obstinacy,

le

be misconstrued and depraved; It is here declared, that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very Natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.) And the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's Natural Body, to be at one time in more places than one. We see that our Church doth here, not only declare that no Adoration is in this Gesture intended, either to the Elements or to Christ's Corporal Presence under the Species of Bread and Wine, but also that, as such a Pretence is absurd and contradictory, so the adoring of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, would be Idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians. So that, as nothing is in it self more indifferent than *this* Gesture in receiving the Holy Communion, there being not one Word said of the Gesture in our Saviours Institution of this Sacrament either before his Death to his Disciples, or after his Ascension to St. Paul, (who hath delivered to us what he received of the Lord about this matter, as he said, that is, *all* that he had received) and as Christ hath Consequently left the *particular* Gesture to the determination of the Church, a Gesture being in the *general* necessary, so this Circumstance of *Symbolizing with the Church of Rome* herein, cannot make Our Churches requiring *Kneeling* to be Unlawful (and much less our Obedience to the Church in using this Gesture) seeing all the Idolatry and *Superstition* too, wherewith the Church of Rome hath abused it, is perfectly removed, and 'tis required by our Church meerly as a decent Reverend Gesture.

4. As to the *Ring in Marriage*: The Church of Rome (as is to be seen in the Office of *Matrimony*, juxta usum Ecclesiæ *Sarisenensis*, abuseth it most notoriously. There you have it, first blessed with *two Prayers*; in the former of which, God is beseeched to send his blessing on this Ring, that she who shall wear it may be Armed with the Power of Heavenly defence, and it may be beneficial to her, to Eternal life, through Christ our Lord. And in the latter, the Priest, Crossing, himself, Prayeth, that God would bless this Ring, which we in thy Holy Name bless, that whosoever shall wear it, may abide in his Peace, &c. Next Holy Water is sprinkled upon the Ring: And lastly, the Priest puts it upon the Brides Thumb, the Bridegroom saying, in the Name of the Father: Then upon her second Finger, saying, and of the Son: Then on the third, saying, and of the Holy Ghost: Then on the fourth, saying, Amen. And there he leaves it. And there is expressed a special Mystery in leaving it upon that Finger. But there is used nothing of this impious or Superstitious fooling about the Ring in our office of Marriage. All the doings about it are, the Ministers putting it on the fourth Finger, the Bridegroom saying after him with this Ring I thee Wed, and the mentioning of it in the Prayer following, as a Token and Pledg of the Vow and Covenant made between the Married Persons. So that 'tis so far from being used as a *Sacramental sign* among us, that it no otherwise differs from a meer civil Ceremony, than as 'tis a Token and Pledg of a Covenant made between the Parties in the most Solemn manner, viz. as in the presence of God. And in truth, this is such a Symbolizing with the Church of Rome, as I should be ashamed to bestow two Words about, but that so many of our Bretheren have been pleased to take offence at it.

Lastly,

Lastly, As to our Observation of certain Holy days:
All I shall say about it is,

1. That there is no Comparison between the number of our Holydays and the *Popish* ones.

2. Our few are purged from all the Superstitious and wicked Solemnizations of the *Popish* ones.

3. We observe scarcely any besides such as wherein we have the Primitive Church for our Example: Excepting those which are enjoined upon the account of Deliverances and Calamities, in which our own Nation is peculiarly concerned.

4. An observation of them void of Superstitious conceits about them, and only as our Church directeth, can have no other than a very good Effect upon our hearts and lives. If we could say as *St Austin* did of the Christians in *his* time, viz. *By Festival Solemnities and set days, we dedicate and sanctify to God, the memory of his Benefits, lest unthankful forgetfulness of them, should in tract of time creep upon us* we should certainly be much the better Christians for the observation of our Holydays. *Mr. Calvin* saith, *in Festis non recipiendis cuperem vos esse Constantiores &c.* *In Epist. ad Monsbelgar-denses, p. 81, 82.* *I* could wish that you would be more constant in your not receiving Festivals, but so, as not to contend and make a stir about all, but about those only which nothing at all tend to Edification, and which have a manifest appearance of Superstition, &c. And he instanceth in those Days which Popery dedicates to the Celebrating of the immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and of her Assumption, on which Holydays nothing, he saith, can be said in the Pulpit, by a servant of God, besides exposing the folly of those who have invented them.

And in another Epistle, *Cæterum cum Festi dies hic abrogati, &c.* *In Epist. ad Hallerum.* Moreover, whereas some of your Country are much offended at the Abrogation of Holy days among

us, and 'tis likely that much odious talk is spread about it: And I make account that I am made the Author of this whole matter, and that by the Ignorant as well as Malicious; I can solemnly testifie of my self, that this was done without my knowledg or desire, &c. Before I ever came into the City, there was no Holy day at all observed besides the Lords day; those which are Celebrated by you were taken away by that same Law of the People, which banisht me and Farel: And'twas rather Tumultuously extorted by the violence of Wicked Men, than decreed legally. Upon my return I obtained this temper (or mean) that Christmasts day should be observed after your manner, but upon the other days extraordinary supplications should be made, the Shops being kept shut in the Morning, but after Dinner, every one should go about his own Business.

And, no doubt, the Governours of *our* Church would be abundantly satisfied with *such* an observation of *most* of our Holy-days, as Mr. *Calvin* ordered at *Geneva*, would the People be generally so far conformable.

And thus I have, I hope, sufficiently shewed, that our Church's Symbolizing in *this* Rite too with the Church of *Rome* no otherwise than she doth, can be no colour for Separation.

It may be objected, that notwithstanding our having several times cited Mr. *Calvin*, for the unlawfulness of Separation from the Church of *England*, on the account of her Symbolizing as she doth with the Church of *Rome*, yet he calleth her Ceremonies *tolerabiles ineptiæ, tolerable fooleries*, which would make one think that he was not in earnest in calling them *tolerable*; *fooling* in the Worship of God being no doubt *intolerable*.

In Answer hereto, let Mr. *Calvin* account for his joining *ineptiæ & tolerabiles* together, but the instances he gives of things he so censured, were such as the Liturgy was cleared of, in the amendment of it under *Queen Elizabeth*, viz. *Prayers for the dead*, (that is, that they might have a happy Resurrection, not such Prayers as supposed Purgatory) *Chrism at Baptism*, and *Extreme Unction*. And besides, he saith, he was informed by Mr. *Knox*, of several other *Popish* Ceremonies that were retained, viz. the Use of *Wax Candles*, *divers Crossings at the Communion*, &c. which Information was not true.

And now, how happy should we think our selves, would our Brethren at length be perswaded to cease fearing where no fear is; as also to fear what is really very frightful; namely, the guilt of so great a sin as that of *Schism*, or making and continuing a breach in the Church by Separation without just cause: The greatness of which sin none have more aggravated than Mr. *Calvin*, and several of our old *Non-Conformists*; who have also zealously born their Testimony against Separation from the Church of *England*, and accordingly did *themselves* hold Communion therewith generally (viz. all the *Presbyterian* Party) to their dying day, though they could not Conform as *Ministers*. And there is *another* very formidable Evil too, which I wish more of our Brethren had a greater sense of, viz. the advantage that our Common Enemy is too like to make of our Sad Divisions, and being crumbled into so many Sects and Parties, and hath *already* made, in order to their final accomplishing their designs upon us. The truth on't is, they *themselves* have had the main hand in those Divisions, they so upbraid us with, (of which we have abundant Evidence) having most industriously followed that advice of the famous

Jam verò ad enervandos Anglos, nihil tam conducit, quàm dissensio & discordia inter illos excitata, perpetuòq; nutrita: Quod citò occasiones meliores suppeditavit, *Camp. de Mont. Hisp. p. 204. Amstel.* famous Jesuit *Campanella*, viz. *There is no such effectual way to weaken the English, as to stir up strife and discord among them, and still to feed it: This will quickly put into our hands very fair advantages and opportunities.* Their main spight is at the Church of *England*, as being well aware, that it hath ever since the Reformation been their most formidable Enemy, and the most impregnable Bulwark in all Christendom against the mighty Power and Policy of their Church of *Rome*. What a madness therefore is it in hearty *Protestants*, to joyn with those People in laying this Church as low as ever they are able! And by contending with our Church about innocent, if not commendable things, upon the account of her symbolizing in them with the Church of *Rome*, eminently to endanger the opening such a breach as shall let in all her Heresies, Superstitions, and Idolatries among us. Which God in his infinite Mercy prevent, by causing us to live more answerably to the happy Means and Opportunities we now enjoy, by quenching our as unreasonable as unchristian fierce Feuds and Animosities, and by making our Church like *Jerusalem* of old, a City compact together, and at Unity within it self. Amen.

F I N I S.

[4.]

A
Modest Examination
OF THE
RESOLUTION
OF THIS
CASE
OF
CONSCIENCE,

WHETHER

The Church of *England's* Symbolizing in some things, so far as it doth with the (confessedly Idolatrous Church of *Rome*, makes it unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of *England*, in those things which are not by the Divine Law necessary, and by those Churches used.

In a Letter to a Friend.

L O N D O N.

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst*, at the Three Crowns and Bible, at the lower End of *Cheapside*. 1683.